

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/026,847	LEANY ET AL.
	Examiner Naschica S Morrison	Art Unit 3632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Naschica S Morrison. (3) _____.

(2) Robert Reeser. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Boede '809.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments that Boede does not teach the present invention because the fastener does not extend outwardly from the inner surface of a housing and then suggested proposed claim language in an attempt to read over the combination of references applied in the Non-Final Office action. Examiner did not agree that proposed claim language regarding the fastener being secured to the inner surface of the housing and extending outwardly therefrom would read over the current rejections..